

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

11 MAR 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR:

Policy and Evaluation, OPPPM

STAT

FROM

: R. E. Hineman
Chairman, "I" Career Service Panel

SUBJECT

: Panel Survey of the Performance Appraisal System

1. The members of the "I" Career Service Panel were asked to respond to your survey of the performance appraisal system. The following represents the views of this Panel.

2. Question One. Compare the new performance appraisal system with the former Fitness Report and describe the ways you feel one is better than the other in serving your needs.

- The only meaningful improvement the "I" Panel members find in the new system over the old fitness report system is the Advanced Work Plan. This plan sets down in agreed fashion what is expected of the individual and serves as a guide upon which to measure his/her performance at the next performance appraisal preparation time.
- The Evaluation of Potential is a useless part of the new system, one which calls upon the supervisor to make a judgment based on his particular experience with the individual which may be totally wrong or irrelevant when other kinds of job opportunities are considered. It has the potential for stigmatizing the individual unduly.
- The rating of specific duties on a scale of one to seven as opposed to the five letter grades of old, while offering more of a gradation upon which to rate the individual, suffers from poorly defined definitions. In addition, whether five or seven grades are used, supervisors still have a tendency to inflate the ratings.
- The narrative is by far more important than the numerical ratings of specific duties for the comparative ranking evaluation process. The narrative aids the Panel in understanding what the supervisor really thinks of the individual he/she is rating.

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

--Having a place for rated people to include comments gives them the feeling that it is "within the system" to do so, rather than somehow outside the bounds of acceptable behavior.

3. Question Two. Identify the information sources you use in your evaluations and the approximate percentages each provides in affecting your decisions. The Performance Appraisal Report, particularly the narrative portion, is used in the comparative evaluation of "I" careerists. In addition, the Panel members weigh heavily discussions with supervisors, their own knowledge of the individual and his/her supervisor, and the opinion of others whose judgment is respected. It is hard to quantify the percentage each input has in affecting Panel decisions since this varies from case to case.

4. Question Three. In your judgment would additional information on each employee be helpful toward improving the validity of the comparative evaluation process? The Panel does not need additional paperwork. What we need is the willingness on the part of each supervisor to present an accurate and clear picture on the narrative of the Performance Appraisal Report.

R. E. Hineman

STAT